

Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-16, 19-21, and 23 had been presented. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-16, 19-21, and 23 were rejected for the reasons detailed below. Applicants have not amended, added, nor cancelled any claims. After the amendments and cancellations, claims 1, 2, 5, 7-16, 19-21, and 23 are pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5, 15-16, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0118015 (herein Gunnarsson et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,561 (herein Angus). The Examiner admits Gunnarsson et al. do not teach or suggest that the wireless wide area network (WWAN) includes a narrowband paging network.

The Examiner relies on Angus to supply that missing element. The Examiner states, “Angus discloses data communication network for minimizing toll-charge dependent links and method of operation.” The Examiner argues that the motivation for combining the teachings of Gunnarsson et al. and Angus “would have been to provide a mechanism for communication in a wireless network such that the user’s mobile station is capable of receiving an urgent message generated by a failed computer server alerting the user about the need to be on-site for immediate solutions or a vending machine that needs to be re-supplied.”

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the Office Action does not present a *prima facie* case for obviousness based upon the teachings of Gunnarsson et al. in view of Angus because these references to not provide a motivation to combine the cited references.

Gunnarsson et al. are not concerned with minimizing toll-charge dependent links present in data communication networks. In fact, Gunnarsson are not at all concerned with how messages are routed in a communication network. Nor are Gunnarsson et al. concerned with providing a mechanism for a user's mobile station to receive an urgent message. They are concerned with methods of informing a mobile terminal connected to a wireless communication network of the availability of a wireless local area network and methods of a mobile unit accessing a wireless local area network. (See Gunnarsson et al. at ¶¶ [0005]-[0006]). Without a need to minimize toll-charge dependent links present in a communication network, and without a need to provide a mechanism for a user's mobile station to receive an urgent message, a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify Gunnarsson et al. to have a WWAN that includes a narrowband paging network.

Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claims 1, 5, 15, 19, and 20. Accordingly, these claims, and all dependent claims thereon, are nonobvious in view of the cited references.

Independent Claim 7

Claims 7-9, 12-14, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gunnarsson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,888,811 (herein Eaton et al.). Claims 8, 9, 12-14, and 23 depend from claim 7. Claims 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gunnarsson et al. in view of Eaton et al., and further in view of “Wireless LAN Access Network Architecture for Mobile Operators” by Juha Ala-Laurila et al. Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 7. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the Office Action does not present a *prima facie* case for obviousness based

upon the teachings of Gunnarsson et al. in view of Eaton et al. because these reference do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 7.

The Office Action admits Gunnarsson et al. fail to teach sending information to a control point of the WLAN to authorize the wireless device to utilize a service through the WLAN and turns to Eaton et al. to supply this missing element. In particular, the Office Action states, “The SNAP130-fig.3 can communicate with the processor 156-fig.3 to authorize the portable device 100 to have a service through the WLAN114, see col. 11, lines 28-46.” Applicants submit that neither the language of col. 11, lines 28-46 nor Eaton et al. in general teach sending information to a control point of the WLAN to authorize the wireless device to utilize a service through the WLAN.

Eaton et al. is directed to methods and systems of providing location data from a wireless local area network to a wireless device, and then generating a location sensitive information request from the wireless device to a wide area communication system based on the location data. Eaton et al. describe several methods for providing the location data to a smart network access point (SNAP). In col. 11, lines 28-46, Eaton et al. describe cooperation between a terminal processor 156 and a SNAP 130 to request location coordinates from a wireless device that has on-board location-determining capability and to receive and store the location coordinates in memory coupled to the terminal processor 156. Thus, this language merely describes cooperation between the SNAP 130 and the terminal processor 156 for the purpose of providing location information to the terminal processor 156.

In fact, rather than authorizing the wireless device, Eaton et al. call for stopping the interaction between the wireless device and the wireless local area network when the wireless device is not allowed on the wireless local area network. (See Eaton et al. at col. 12, lines 28-32;

col. 13, lines 36-40; col. 15, lines 14-18). Therefore, because Gunnarsson et al. in view of Eaton et al. fail to teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in independent claim 7, this claim is patentable over Gunnarsson et al. in view of Eaton et al. Because claims 8-14 and 23 depend from claim 7, these claims are patentable for at least the same reason.

All claims should now be in condition for allowance, and accordingly a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues, the examiner is urged to contact applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency associated with this submission, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

In the event that an extension of time is required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of which is required to make this response timely, and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such, to deposit account number 08-0219.

Date: December 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Wilmer Cutler, Pickering
Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Tel: (617) 526-6454
Fax: (617) 526-5000


Michael A. Diener
Registration No. 37,122
Attorney for Applicant